

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Minutes

Ballona Creek Watershed Task Force

Wednesday, January 9, 2002

I Introductions

Jessica Dominguez welcomed meeting participants who briefly introduced themselves.

The following handouts were given: The meeting agenda, the December 2001 meeting minutes, and the Draft Ballona Creek Watershed Procedures and Protocols.

The Minutes and Agenda were approved as written.

II Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) Presentation

Ginachi Amah of the Los Angeles County Water Quality Control Board gave an informational presentation on the definition and procedures of TMDLs. A TMDL is defined as a total maximum daily load, which is how much of a pollutant can be discharged to bodies of water and still meet the water quality standards established to protect human and wildlife health.

After a very interactive question and answer time, copies of Ginachi's Power Point presentation were requested. Jessica offered to send them out with the minutes.

III Adoption of Procedures and Protocols

Jessica gave a quick overview of the status: The development of procedures and protocols started four months ago and we were able to use the Dominguez Channel Watershed Advisory Council procedures and protocol as a template, with revisions to fit the need of this watershed. The Mission Statement was adopted at the last meeting. The goal was to adopt the other sections of the Procedures and Protocols at this meeting.

"Attendance and Participation at Meetings" section:

Item 3: No objection was made to the changes.

"Decision Making" section:

Item 2: No objection was made to the newly added definitions for "consensus." Steve Fleischli of Santa Monica BayKeeper mentioned that he came to this meeting because he had some concern that the way "consensus" is defined may affect potential future citizen litigation against polluters. But he later expressed that he is fine with "consensus" as is now defined in the document after learning more about the membership of the Task Force.

Item 7: No objection was made to the change.

“Amendments” section:

Clarification to the last sentence was made. No objection was made to the change. It was the consensus of the task force to adopt the Procedures and Protocols as presented.

“Issues to be Addressed” section:

Further changes (addition, deletion, and re-grouping) will be made to this section during the following discussion, and the changes will be presented at the next meeting.

IV Watershed Issues

Anne Dove of the National Parks Service’s Rivers and Trails Program facilitated a lively and productive discussion of the draft issues list noted above. Anne started with each issue written on a large post-it and grouped according to preliminary categories. After significant discussion and many adjustments to the named issues as well as their groupings, The Task Force agreed to continue this discussion at the next meeting. In the meantime, a revised list, based on the discussion, would be distributed to the stakeholders. Next time the issues, with their names and relationships, will be finalized, and the task force will seek to prioritize the items.

The task force agreed to an early suggestion to title this list “ Issues of Interest to the Watershed”, recognizing that issues listed may have varying degrees of support and interest and, at least initially, may represent the thought of just one stakeholder. Once listed, an issue may be generally regarded as an item of interest or potential interest.

V RFP Sub-Committee

Jim Lamm reported that the subcommittee had its first meeting, but not all members were present due to the holidays. The first meeting was a preliminary meeting and no action was taken. The committee was introduced to the County’s typical Request for Proposal (RFP) and contract procedures and briefly discussed some of the tasks ahead. These include development of the RFP (including consultant scope and schedule), identification of potential consultants, and development of consultant qualification and selection criteria. The Committee also discussed the general time frame for the whole process, including RFP issuance and proposal receipt, review, and evaluation.

Guangyu noted that the results of the issues discussion will be incorporated into the RFP and become an important guidance to the consultants’ scope of work. The grouped and prioritized issues might also suggest the formation of possible task force committees, depending upon stakeholder interest and decisions. Jim also reported that NPS’s Anne Dove participated in the first meeting, substituting for the out-of-town Jim Donovan. Jim reminded the RFP subcommittee members that their active

participation is needed to develop the RFP in a timely manner and to get a consultant team on board under contract with the County. The RFP group will meet again from 2-4 p.m., January 31 at LAC-DPW in Alhambra.

VI Next Meeting

The task force agreed to meet regularly on second Wednesday afternoons in this same room, although Jim Lamm reminded the group of the previously expressed desire to have at least a few evening meetings at some point in the near future. Culver City's Joe Susca confirmed the availability of the Patacchia Room for the daytime meetings and will make arrangements for the rest of the year. To use the same room for evening meetings, Joe noted that the most available weeknights would be Tuesdays.

Regarding presentations on watershed-related subjects of interest, Jim commented on the good quality and appropriateness of the programs we have had to date on an adhoc basis: Jessica Hall on historic streams in the upper watershed, Mike Mullin on constructed wetlands, and Ginachi Amah on TMDLs. While noting a goal of developing a coordinated list of presentations and field trips in the future, he asked for suggestions for a presentation for the next meeting. Playa Vista's Catherine Tyrrell indicated she likely could arrange a presentation about the plans for their creekside Promenade Park, if the group agreed, which they did.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 13, 2002, from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m. in the Dan Patacchia Room at the plaza level of Culver City Hall, 9770 Culver Boulevard, Culver City, 90230. Free parking is available under the building via the entrance on Duquesne Avenue.

BALLONA CREEK WATERSHED TASK FORCE ATTENDEES
January 9, 2002

NAME	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL
Alamillo, James	Heal the Bay	jalamillo@healthebay.org
Amah, Ginachi	LARWCB	gamah@rb4.swrcb.ca.gov
Ariki, Menerva	LA County Department of Public Works	mdaoud@dpw.co.la.ca.us
Bass, Carvel	Army Corps of Engineers	cbass@spl.usace.army.mil
Bera, Angie	SM Baykeeper	octopus@smbaykeeper.org
Crosse, John	Vista del Mar Neighbors Association	jocrosse@mediaone.net
Curtiss, D.	D.A	curt7880@aol.com
Delgado, Doug	Calvin Abe Assoc. Landscape Architects	ddelgado@ahbe.com
Dominguez, Jessica	LA County Department of Public Works	jdominguez@dpw.co.la.ca.us
Dove, Anne	National Park Service Rivers and Trails	anne_dove@nps.gov
Ehlers, Doug		dougehlers@mediaone.net
Fleischli, Steve	SM Baykeeper	sfleischli@smbaykeeper.org
Fox, Abby	Ballona Wetlands Foundation	abbyfox@ballona-wetlands.org
Gold, Bobbi	BCR	bobbi.gold@worldnet.att.net
Hackett, Howard	LAC Bike Coalition	hhackett@juno.com
Lamm, Jim	Ballona Creek Renaissance	JWLamm@aol.com
Plauzoles, Lu	Santa Monica Bay Audubon	lacite@aol.com
Rutherford, Cassandra	LA County Dept. of Beaches and Harbors	cassandrar@dbh.co.la.ca.us
Shapiro, Mim	Ballona Creek Renaissance	hankshapiro@juno.com
Susca, Joe	Culver City, Senior Management Analyst	joe.susca@culvercity.org
Tam, Wing	City of Los Angeles- Watershed Protection Div.	wtam@san.lacity.org
Tyrrell, Catherine	Playa Vista	ctyrrell@playavista.com
Wang, Guang-Yu	Santa Monica Bay Restoration Project	gwang@rb4.swrcb.ca.gov